

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,230,171 (Pacifici, et al.). In addition, in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1-11 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being “anticipated” by Pacifica and U.S. Patent 6,411,989 (Anupam, et al.). In the discussion of this rejection, though, it appears that the Examiner contends that the claims are “unpatentable over” Pacifici, et al. in view of Anupam, et al. Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner clarify whether the rejection set forth in paragraph 8 of the Office Action is because the Examiner contends the claims are “anticipated by” the references, or because the Examiner contends the claims are “unpatentable over” the references.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, also asked that Figure 1 be labeled “Prior Art,” and Applicants are herein asking that Figure 1 be amended as the Examiner suggested. In view of this, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims, and new Claims 12-14, which are dependent from Claim 1, are being added to describe preferred features of the invention.

Claims 1-14 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is respectfully requested, thus, to reconsider and to withdraw the above-identified rejections of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103, and to allow these claims and new Claims 12-14.

The present invention relates to methods and systems that enable multiple computer users to work simultaneously on documents, and this is accomplished through the use of two applications referred to as NodeManagers and PageManagers. In accordance with a preferred embodiment of the invention, a server sends a NodeManager to each user machine. When a user machine requests a page, the server embeds a PageManager in that page, and sends the page, with the PageManager embedded in it, to the requesting machine. As explained in detail in the present application, the PageManager and the NodeManager work together to receive, communicate and manage changes to the page.

Both Pacifici, et al. and Anupam, et al. describe systems that enable several uses to input information simultaneously into shared documents. Neither of these references, though, discloses the above-described cooperative relationship between the NodeManager and the PageManager, both of which are received from the server, for managing page changes.

It is noted that in Anupam, et al, a central server downloads a surrogate into each user computer. However, as explained in Applicants previous Amendment, there are significant differences between this surrogate and the PageManager of this invention.

Also, in the procedure described in Pacifici, et al, the collaboration server may insert markup components into the shared documents, and these markup components work with client side managers 114 to help manage the collaboration system. Importantly, though, these client side managers are not downloaded to the user machines from the central server. This is an important distinction between these client side managers and the NodeManagers used in the present invention.

Thus, the present invention, in contrast to the procedure disclosed in Pacifici, et al, separates the communication management functions that are downloaded to the user machines into two parts: the NodeManager and the PageManager. This provides the procedure of the present invention with considerable flexibility. More generic functions can be included in the NodeManager, while more page specific functions can be included in the PageManager.

Each of the independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 clearly describe differences between the claim and the prior art. In particular, Claims 1 and 9 describe the features that both the NodeManager and the PageManager are sent to the plurality of user computers from the server. Claims 1 and 9 describe the further feature that changes to and from the page are received from and sent to the PageManager via the NodeManager.

Claim 10, which is directed to a method for sharing a browser, describes the feature that the NodeManager and the PageManager are downloaded or sent to the user computer, and that changes are sent to and from the page via the PageManager and the NodeManager. Claim 11 is directed to a medium having a program for sharing a browser among plural computers and Claim 11, similar to Claim 10, describes the feature that the computers receive the NodeManager and the PageManager from the server, and that changes to a page are sent to and from the page via the PageManager and the NodeManager.

As mentioned above, this arrangement of the present invention is of utility because it separates the communications functions that are downloaded to the user computer from the central server, into two sets. The more generic functions can be performed by the NodeManager, and the more page specific functions can be performed by the PageManager.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and it is believed that these other references are no more pertinent than Pacifici, et al. or Anupam, et al.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-8 and 12-14 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-14.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawings, and the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102, the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-14. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy